



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

BRIEF MENTION

The Poems of Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey. By Frederick Morgan Padelford (University of Washington Publications: Language and Literature, vol. I. Seattle, 1920). The *raison d'être* of this book is so well expressed by Professor Padelford that one must be pardoned for quoting the paragraph in full. "It is now rather more than a century since George Frederick Nott published his elaborate edition of the works of Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey. Since then no scholarly edition has been attempted. During this time, however, many facts bearing upon the career of Surrey have come to light, a noteworthy biography has been published, studies dealing with various phases of the poetry have appeared, and manuscript versions of many of the lyrics and two fresh texts of the fourth book of the *Æneid* have been discovered. The time therefore seems ripe for a new edition that will take advantage of this fresh knowledge, giving more authoritative readings in the poems and furnishing the equipment needed by the scholar. The present volume aims to meet this need." Nothing can be said against this program. Professor Padelford's purpose is justified by the reported facts and circumstances.

It is not an equally simple matter to pass judgment on the execution of this purpose. Having in mind Professor Padelford's trustworthy scholarship, and his constructive skill, one is predisposed to pass a favorable judgement on every feature of this work. But after an effort to construe all 'findings' favorably, there remains the conviction that he has compelled his colleagues to ask a number of questions that reflect aspects of disappointment. The form of the publication, of course, suggests an application of the law of the "kinds." Conventionally an academic monograph is not governed by the structural principles of a book. Altho yielding to the desirability of starting a new series of University Publications, Professor Padelford's prefatory statements indicate that he has had in mind the making of a 'book,' "published to the common profit and delectation of the many," rather than a monograph for the use of specialists. He has produced a scholarly edition of Surrey's poems which will take its place by the side of Foxwell's edition of *The Poems of Sir Thomas Wyatt* in critical value, but the difference between his "Critical Notes" and Foxwell's "Commentary" is rather unfavorable to the general usefulness of his work.

Professor Padelford had a goodly share in the preliminary investigations for making accessible the texts of Surrey's compositions in the most authentic form. In respect, therefore, of this feature this "new edition" has a value and significance of first-

class order. But editorially, or in the matter of planning a book, all has not been done to facilitate the use of this new material. Helpful would have been a tabulation of the poems with reference to manuscripts and printed books, giving a view of the textual sources and traditions, which is left to be gained by a sifting of the Textual Notes and the Bibliography. At all events one feels that the facts under this head might have been presented in a fashion to require less effort of the reader in bringing together separated passages. For example, what is to be noted respecting the occurrence of No. 38 in MS. *E*. is not indicated on p. 173, but on p. 219 (where, however, the number is misprinted 39). Similarly with No. 21; the statement on p. 171, "Found also in *D*," does not suggest the fact recorded on pp. 186, 219; and what is said of No. 21 in connection with *Harl.* on p. 219 is not confirmed on p. 186, nor is it in agreement with *Anglia* XXIX, 273. Moreover, the specific designation by numerals (p. 219) of the poems in *Harl.* and also of those in *D*. and *E*. makes conspicuous the lack of the corresponding designation of the three poems in *Hill*; and in lieu of the suggested tabulation, the twenty-eight poems of *P*. and the eighteen of *A*. should also have been numbered. Another detail may be added to show how difficult it will be for the studious reader to find the desired information on a particular point. Where is he to find a statement of what constitutes the manuscript or printed basis of the *Æneid* II? Is he to make the inference from "Certain Bookes" on p. 220; or turn to *The Mod. Lang. Review*, XIV, 164, or elsewhere?

Professor Padelford has had the advantage of availing himself of the opportune moment for an attractive task. That attractiveness is surely due in good measure to the privilege of presenting the results of a number of special investigations. The degree of satisfaction with which the investigator observes the report and incorporation of his work must be a test of how the reporter has done his work. Let this test be applied to the critical note (pp. 200-201) in which is summarized what is known or conjectured concerning *Æneid* II. Now, should one expect Dr. Dittes to be quite content not to be mentioned in this connection? And does the rather incidental occurrence of the names Imelmann and Fest serve to give the reader a just estimate of what these scholars have contributed to the subject? Also in the critical introduction to *Æneid* IV, there is not offered the desired well-constructed report of the several important investigations listed in the Bibliography. Besides, there is here a striking disproportion in the allotment of space to the different sides of the subject. Especially disproportionate is the space devoted to the evidence of certain grammatical features and metrical details. Unfortunately the grammatical forms, in this instance, are of little consequence as evidence; and the metrical details are misinterpreted. Amends for all this, how-

ever, Professor Padelford has made in supplying a most desirable edition of the text of *Æneid* iv. The Tottle and the Hargrave texts are printed side by side and the readings of the only extant copy of *D* are exhibited in collected form on the basis of Tottle. The three sixteenth century 'versions' are thus with scrupulous accuracy made accessible for further study.

By no easily drawn inference from the prevailing character of the "Critical Notes" is Professor Padelford's exact purpose made obvious; one cannot with certainty describe the particular class of readers he has had in mind. Notes interpretative of thought and figure are either too meagre or altogether wanting to attract and instruct the more general reader; and the scholar too will look in vain for a satisfactory indication of what has been accumulating in this department of study. It would be unfair to require the compiler of a commentary to report with uniform minuteness all preceding interpretative suggestions; yet there is a tribute to be paid to precedence in time that is usually well deserved. Thus, to take a simple example, altho the comment on No. 4 is interpretative in the desired sense, why should not a reference be made to Dr. H. Nagel, who in 1889 also placed the three texts before the reader and added a discriminating comparison of the methods of Surrey and Wyatt? And Professor Padelford, who so well appreciates the helpfulness of a well constructed critical apparatus of study, would certainly have gratified his colleagues by supplying all references to show in detail how the recorded judgments and observations have been arrived at. Dr. Koeppel gave the clue to the method one has in mind in this connection. He listed what Nott had noted with respect to sources, and then proceeded to his own additions and modifications. No commentator should do less than apply this method when dealing with the study of Surrey's poems, which is marked by definite stages of progress. That Professor Padelford has put the reader and student to a disadvantage by not observing this method as consistently as possible may be seen by turning to the notes on No. 15 (p. 185), where the first note is due to Nott and the second to Koeppel (p. 85). Comparison of notes on No. 11 (p. 182) and the editor's *Early Sixteenth Century Lyrics*, p. 130, suggests the question, Why have the designations "(N.)" and "(K.)" been cancelled. Details of this class may appear to be too unimportant to sustain the weight of serious criticism; but Professor Padelford will not regard them in that light, for it is obvious that he has had a pattern in mind that has led him, without his conscious consent, beyond the limits of approved conciseness.

As a whole the critical notes on the *Æneid* represent careful and efficient consideration of the various classes of pertinent details. But one must regret the absence of a philosophic discussion of the cultural aspects of Surrey's indebtedness to preceding translations.

As to the order in which the two books were translated, the editor is 'inclined to think' that the second book preceded the fourth; but so far as this conclusion (perhaps expressed with too much caution) is based on metrical features it is not undeniably strengthened. In this division of the argument, as also in that which relates to the comparison of the three forms of the fourth book, metrical details are not well handled. There is a fundamental error here, that is easily detected in the statement that Surrey intended "a judicious interspersion of trochees and other feet" (p. 207), and in the use of the descriptives anapæsts and amphibrachs. The permissible resolution of arsis or thesis corrects the misunderstanding of the rhythm. And it should be clear that there is a misleading use of terms that properly describe a mere sequence of syllables and not a possible rhythmic or structural foot. The (Alexandrian) amphibrach is one of these non-structural forms, so is the amphimacer, and the pyrrhic, and the tribrach. Dionysius of Halicarnassus declared the rhythmic quality of the amphibrach to be specious; and the simplest law of rhythm should have diverted Skeat from the attempt to prove its structural use, and have convinced Mr. Omond that "our metrists" have "some reason" for not recognizing it as an English foot (*A Study of Metre*, p. 94).

The Introduction consists of "The Dramatic Career of Surrey" (pp. 7-36), and "Surrey's Contribution to English Verse" (pp. 37-42), two chapters unequal in length and differing widely in value. The titular use of the term dramatic is appropriately descriptive of the poet's short and eventful career, which Professor Padelford has sketched in a finely sympathetic and effective manner. What is here done must leave little more to be done in the tracing of the relation between the series of public and political events and that of the influences and circumstances of the poet's literary activities. In the second of these introductory chapters one finds less that is complete. Wyatt and Surrey as poets are compared, but in terms that are for the most part too general; and Surrey's "contribution to English verse" is considered chiefly with reference to the external forms of poetry, and with insufficient critical analysis of his poetic art as a whole.

This publication represents an excellent preparation for a handy and well-made book to take the place of the Aldine edition, and Professor Padelford's colleagues must surely be of one mind in hoping that he will proceed to supply that demand.

J. W. B.

English and American teachers who prefer an abbreviated and expurgated Rabelais to the unadulterated text will welcome *Readings from Rabelais* by the late W. F. Smith, recently published at the Cambridge University Press. Known by a translation of Rabelais, by articles in *R. E. R.* and *M. L. R.*, and by *Rabelais in His Writings* (Cambridge, 1918), he was well qualified to make this edition. The selections include about a fourth of Rabelais's chapters. Brief summaries of the others are added. All four books are represented, most largely *Gargantua* and the *Quart Livre*. While most of the chapters given are essential to an understanding of the author, I miss the prologue to *Gargantua*, the brilliant *Propos des beuveurs*, far more important to a student of style than the giants' Ciceronian correspondence, the speech of Janotus de Bragmardo, Panurge's talk about debtors and creditors, the interviews with Trouillogan and Judge Bridoye, and the account of the storm in the *Quart Livre*. Still more regrettable is the fact that Mr. Smith found it necessary to expurgate his text so extensively. In so doing he prevents a full appreciation of Rabelais's curiosity, humor, and gift of expression. He loses much of the *sustantificque mouelle* we are invited to enjoy. Occasionally, too, the reader is misled as to the meaning of the passage. Thus *eulx retornans* (p. 9) makes no sense because the fact that Gargantua has gone "es lieux secrets" has been modestly omitted. Again *le* (p. 136, ll. 10, 11) cannot be understood, for the noun to which it refers has been removed.

Except where such devotion to *bonnes mœurs* has interfered, the text has been carefully reproduced after the editions of Abel Lefranc, Jouaust, and Marty-Laveaux. The notes are, in the main, satisfactory, but a glossary is still needed for the student who is beginning his acquaintance with sixteenth-century forms and vocabulary. While waiting for the completion of M. Lefranc's edition of Rabelais, scholars may consult with profit Mr. Smith's notes, particularly for information with regard to Rabelais's sources, nearly all of which he thought he had determined. The edition is accompanied by an adequate account of Rabelais's life, with no attempt, unfortunately, at literary criticism, by an appendix on the educational system which Rabelais combated and another on J. E. Sandys and Mr. Arthur Tilley.

H. C. L.